

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JOHN ROBERT DEMOS, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAY INSLEE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C22-5793-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's objection (Dkt. No. 3) to the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of the Honorable David W. Christel, United States Magistrate Judge (Dkt. No. 2). Judge Christel's R&R recommends that Plaintiff's proposed complaint be dismissed without prejudice for non-compliance with the 1992 Bar Order. (*See* Dkt. No. 2.) The R&R summarizes the proposed complaint's allegations, the Bar Order's conditions, and Plaintiff's suits within this District. (*See* Dkt. No. 2 at 1–3.) The Court need not repeat that information here.

Plaintiff's objection to the R&R takes issue with the Bar Order and its conditions—not the R&R's interpretation of the Order. (*See* Dkt. No. 3.) This collateral attack of the Bar Order is not responsive to the analysis or conclusions contained within the R&R and, therefore, does not

trigger this Court's review of the R&R.¹

Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS that:

1. Plaintiff's objection to the R&R (Dkt. No. 3) is OVERRULED;
2. The R&R (Dkt. No. 2) is ADOPTED and APPROVED;
3. The proposed complaint (Dkt. No. 1-1) is DISMISSED without prejudice;
4. The motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Dkt. No. 1) is DENIED; and
5. The Clerk is DIRECTED to send copies of this Order to Plaintiff and to Judge

Christel.

DATED this 18th day of November 2022.



John C. Coughenour
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ A district court only reviews those portions of an R&R to which a party properly objects. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Objections are required to enable the court to “focus attention on those issues—factual and legal—that are at the heart of the parties’ dispute.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 147 (1985). The court is not required to review “any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Id.* at 149. Said another way, for an objection to be proper, it must point to specific error contained within the R&R. *See, e.g., United States v. Diaz-Lemus*, 2010 WL 2573748, slip op. at 1 (D. Ariz. 2010); *see Djelassi v. ICE Field Office Director*, 434 F. Supp. 3d 917, 919 (W.D. Wash. 2020).